

Metal-Insulator Transitions in Degenerate Hubbard Models and A_xC_{60}

Jian Ping Lu

Department of Physics and Astronomy,

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27599

(February 1, 2008)

Abstract

Mott-Hubbard metal-insulator transitions in N -fold degenerate Hubbard models are studied within the Gutzwiller approximation. For any rational filling with x (integer) electrons per site it is found that metal-insulator transition occurs at a critical correlation energy $U_c(N, x) = U_c(N, 2N - x) = \gamma(N, x)|\bar{\epsilon}(N, x)|$, where $\bar{\epsilon}$ is the band energy per particle for the uncorrelated Fermi-liquid state and $\gamma(N, x)$ is a geometric factor which increases linearly with x . We propose that the alkali metal doped fullerenes A_xC_{60} can be described by a 3-fold degenerate Hubbard model. Using the current estimate of band width and correlation energy this implies that most of A_xC_{60} , at integer x , are Mott-Hubbard insulators and A_3C_{60} is a strongly correlated metal.

PACS numbers: 71.10.+x, 71.30.+h, 74.70.W

The discovery of superconductivity in A_3C_{60} [1] has spurred great interest in alkali metal doped fullerides [2]. Beside A_3C_{60} , stable phases such as Rb_1C_{60} , Na_2C_{60} , K_4C_{60} were synthesized [2,3]. One unusual property is that except A_3C_{60} all integer x phases are found to behave like insulators [4]. This contradicts the band structure calculations which imply that all of them are metals due to the 3-fold degeneracy of the t_{1u} molecular orbitals which forming the conduction bands [5]. In this letter we show that the strong (compared with the band width) intramolecular electron-electron correlation is responsible for this unusual property. The results we have obtained also shed light on the instability of the non-integer x phases [6].

The existence of strong correlation in pure C_{60} is supported by spectroscopy experiments. Photoemission shows an insulating gap of 2.6eV, while the photo-conductivity and absorption indicate excitation at 1.6eV. This discrepancy is interpreted as due to strong correlation which results in a large excitonic binding energy. The estimated correlation energy $U \sim 1eV$ [4,7,8] is much larger than the conduction band width $W \sim 0.2 - 0.4eV$ [5,10]. Thus, it has been suggested that that A_3C_{60} is a Mott-Hubbard insulator and the superconducting phase is non stoichiometric [7]. However, structural, transport and spectroscopic measurements show that the superconducting phase is stoichiometric and there is no evidence of insulating behavior in A_3C_{60} . Even more interesting is that for $x \neq 3$ integer stoichiometric phases no metallic behavior have been observed so far. Therefore neither a simple Hubbard model which prefers insulating at half filling ($x = 3$), nor the simple band filling model which predict metallic behavior for all phases, can explain the unusual metal-insulator transitions observed.

Clearly the 3-fold degeneracy of the conduction band can not be neglected. This leads us to study the general N -fold degenerate Hubbard model at rational fillings. We find that the unusual metal-insulator transitions observed can be understood in term of Mott-Hubbard transition in the degenerate Hubbard model. It is found that for a general N -fold degenerate Hubbard model at rational filling $x/2N$, where the average number of electrons per site (x) is an integer, the metal-insulator transition occurs at a critical U_c which increases with both

x and N . U_c is found to be the largest at half filling $x = N$ for a given degeneracy N (except $N = 2$). Therefore it is possible that the system is a metal at half filling while insulating away from it. Our results lay a solid theoretical foundation for the interpretation that A_xC_{60} are either Mott-Hubbard insulators or strongly correlated metals and provide a rationale to understand the unusual metal-insulator transitions in this family of materials and molecular metals in general.

Consider the general N -fold degenerate Hubbard model with the correlation energy U independent of orbitals and spins

$$H = \sum_{i,j,\alpha,\beta} t_{i,j}^{\alpha,\beta} c_{j,\beta}^+ c_{i,\alpha} + \frac{U}{2} \sum_{i,\alpha \neq \beta} n_{i,\alpha} n_{i,\beta}, \quad (1)$$

where $\alpha = (r, \sigma)$ include both spin (σ) and orbital (r) indices; $n_{i,\alpha} = c_{i,\alpha}^+ c_{i,\alpha}$ are number operators. Let L be the size of the lattice and M be the total number of electrons. By rational filling we mean that the average number of electrons per site $x = M/L$ is an integer. For such a filling there exists a well defined insulating state where there are exactly x electrons localized at each site. Obviously for a sufficiently large U hopping is forbidden, and the ground state is insulating. As U decreases a metal-insulator transition, at a certain critical U_c , is expected. For the case of the non-degenerate Hubbard model the only rational filling is the half filling ($N = x = 1$); in this case it is well known that the ground state at large U is an ordered magnetic insulator [9]. For the degenerate Hubbard model, in general, the insulating state could also be ordered. However, we will consider the paramagnetic (or disordered) insulating state only because our primary interest is A_xC_{60} , where the lattice is non bi-partite and large amount of intrinsic disorders are known to exist [10,11].

In the insulating state, the kinetic energy is zero and the total energy per site E_0 is given by the correlation energy $PE = \frac{U}{2}x(x-1)$. Imagining a situation very close to the metal-insulation transition such that only one site has $x+1$ electrons, the correlation costs U while the kinetic energy gained for the excitation is of the order W . Since there are x electrons per site, there are x possible ways of making such an excitation. Therefore one might expect

$U_c(x) \sim xW$ [12].

In the case of the non-degenerate Hubbard model at half filling the rigorous result $U_c = 8|\bar{\epsilon}| = 2W$ was obtained by Brinkman and Rice [13] within the Gutzwiller approximation [14]. The central point of Gutzwiller approximation is to associate a projection factor η with every doubly occupied site, assuming that the many-body wavefunction can be written as a superposition of states with different numbers of doubly occupied sites ν . The optimal ν is determined variationally by calculating the expectation value of the Hamiltonian. In the thermodynamic limit the summation over ν is dominated by the optimal ν term, then the kinetic and potential energies can be calculated by counting the number of configurations which contribute.

We have carried out similar calculations rigorously for the general N -fold degenerate Hubbard model in a limit close to the metal-insulator transition. The details of counting are rather tedious and will be published elsewhere [15]. Here we will simply state assumptions and results and discuss their implications for A_xC_{60} .

Let x be the average number of electrons per site and L be the total number of sites. We assume that there is complete permutation symmetry between all orbitals and spins, so the number of electrons occupying each $\alpha = (r, \sigma)$ state is $m = \frac{xL}{2N}$. Near the metal-insulator transition the probability that a site is occupied by more than $x + 1$ electrons is very small as it costs $2U$ or more energy. Thus we assume that each site can only be “empty” ($x - 1$ electrons), “singly-occupied” (x electrons) or “doubly-occupied” ($x + 1$ electrons). Let $2N\nu \ll L$ be the total number of doubly occupied sites, then by symmetry the number of empty sites is also $2N\nu$. Every doubly occupied site costs a correlation energy U with respect to the insulator state where there are exactly x electrons on every site. The Gutzwiller wavefunction is constructed from the uncorrelated Slater determinant $|SL\rangle = |\{k_1, \alpha_1, \dots, k_n, \alpha_n\}\rangle$ by projecting out doubly occupied states with a weighting factor η

$$|\phi\rangle = \prod_{i,\alpha,\beta} (1 - \eta c_{i,\alpha}^+ c_{i,\beta}^+) |SL\rangle. \quad (2)$$

This wave function is a linear combination of a large number of states with different ν . Following the original calculation of Gutzwiller, the expectation value of the Hamiltonian is dominated by the state with the optimal ν which is to be determined variationally. After a lengthy derivation the average energy per particle with respect to the paramagnetic insulating state is found to be [15]

$$E(N, x) = Q(N, x, \nu, m) \bar{\epsilon}(x) + \frac{\nu}{m} U, \quad (3)$$

where $\bar{\epsilon}(x)$ is the kinetic (band) energy per particle in the uncorrelated state with the center of the band chosen to be zero, $\bar{\epsilon}(x = 2N) = 0$. The quotient Q , which reflects the reduction of the hopping term in the correlated state [14,15], is given by

$$Q(N, x) = \frac{\alpha_{N,x} \nu (m - 2x\nu)}{m^2} \left(1 + \eta \frac{(m - 2x\nu)}{\alpha_{N,x} \nu} \right)^2, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\alpha_{N,x} = \begin{cases} \frac{2Nx}{2N-1} & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ or } 2N-1 \\ x & \text{if } 2 \leq x \leq 2N-2, \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

and the projection parameter η is

$$\eta = \begin{cases} \frac{2x\nu}{m-2x\nu} \sqrt{\frac{N}{2N-1}} & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ or } 2N-1 \\ \frac{x\nu}{m-2x\nu} & \text{if } 2 \leq x \leq 2N-2. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Substituting eqs.4-6 into Eq. (3) and minimizing the energy with respect to $\bar{\nu} = \nu/m$ leads to

$$\bar{\nu} = \frac{1}{4x} \left(1 - \frac{U}{U_c} \right) \quad (7)$$

and the energy per particle

$$E_0 = \frac{\gamma(N, x) \bar{\epsilon}}{8x} \left(1 - \frac{U}{U_c} \right)^2, \quad (8)$$

where U is given by

$$U_c(N, x) = \gamma(N, x) |\bar{\epsilon}(N, x)| = \begin{cases} \frac{2Nx}{2N-1} \left(1 + \sqrt{\frac{2N-1}{N}} \right)^2 |\bar{\epsilon}(N, x)| & \text{if } x = 1 \text{ or } 2N-1 \\ 4x |\bar{\epsilon}(N, x)| & \text{if } 2 \leq x \leq 2N-2. \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

As U increases toward U_c , the number of doubly occupied states approach zero. Thus the Mott-Hubbard transition occurs at U_c .

Eq.9 is the main result of this paper. Several points are worth mentioning. a) The particle-hole symmetry is preserved if $|\bar{\epsilon}(N, x)| = \frac{x}{2N-x}|\bar{\epsilon}(N, 2N-x)|$; this is expected because the starting Hamiltonian Eq. (1) contains particle-hole symmetry. b) For $N = 1$ the only rational filling is half filling $x=1$, the Brinkman-Rice result $U_c = 8|\bar{\epsilon}|$ is recovered. c) Regardless of the band structure, U_c generally increases with x reaching the maximum at half filling $x = N$ ($N = 2$ is an exception); thus, for a degenerate Hubbard system it is more difficult for it to become a Mott insulator. d) The above results apply only to integer x . For non-integer x , if U is larger than U_c , there will be tendency for the system to phase separate into integer phases to lower the total energy. This may explain the experimental observation that non-integer x phases are not stable A_xC_{60} where the alkali ions can segregate together with electrons which screen out the long range Coulomb repulsion. Details of this issue will be explored elsewhere.

To make a quantitative estimate, one needs to know the band structure. In the case of a flat band with the bandwidth W , $\bar{\epsilon}(N, x) = \frac{x-2N}{4N}W$. One obtains the simple result $U_c(N, x) = \frac{x(2N-x)}{N}W$ ($x \neq 1, 2N-1$). This agrees qualitatively with the simple argument discussed earlier. Fig.1 shows plots of U_c/W vs $x/2N$ for several N values.

Now let us turn to the specific application of the above results to the metal-insulator transitions in A_xC_{60} . It is known that each alkali metal donates one electron and that the conduction band is formed by overlap of the 3-fold degenerate t_{1u} molecular orbitals. For $x = 1, 3, 4$ structures are known to be rhombohedral, face-center-cubic and body-center-tetragonal, respectively [3]. For all these structures LDA *ab initio* calculations suggest that all of them are metals [5]. Experimentally, except $x = 3$, all phases with integer x are found to be insulating. It has also been shown that the band structure can be accurately represented by a 3-band tight-binding model, in particular the density of states was shown to be approximately flat due to the intrinsic orientational disorder [10]. The band width W determined from both experiments [16] and calculations [5,10] is very small, $W \sim 0.2-0.4eV$.

On the other hand, spectroscopic studies [4,7] and theoretical calculations [8] suggest that the intramolecular electron correlation energy is around $U \sim 1\text{eV}$. The value of U is expected to remain unchanged with doping because the screening is provided by the large number of molecular orbitals above t_{1u} , which is not affected by the doping. From Eq. (9) and assuming a flat band one obtains $U_c(x, N=3)/W = 2.6, 2.67, 3$ respectively for $x = 1, 2, 3$. Thus if the parameters are such that $2.67W < U < 3W$, which is where the current best estimate of W and U fall, then the whole family of A_xC_{60} for $x = 1, 2, 4, 5$ are Mott-Hubbard insulators while $x = 3$ could be a strongly correlated metal. Of course we caution that the U_c calculated here only represents the lower bound; however, we expect the qualitative results $U_c(N, x) \leq U_c(N, N)$, $U_c(N, N) \sim NW$ will hold for the exact U_c .

In conclusion we have studied Mott-Hubbard transitions in the N -fold degenerate Hubbard model within the Gutzwiller approximation. It is shown that for any integer number of electrons per site there exists a critical correlation energy U_c above which the system is a Mott-Hubbard insulator. U_c is found to be sensitive to both the degeneracy and filling. We propose that the family of materials A_xC_{60} can be described by a 3-fold degenerate Hubbard model. With reasonable estimates for the band width and the intramolecular correlation energy, we show that it is possible that for most integer phases ($x = 1, 2, 4, 5$) the materials are Mott-Hubbard insulators and A_3C_{60} is likely a strongly correlated metal despite the fact that U is several times of the band width.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to M.P. Gelfand for many discussions, and collaborations on related subjects. I thank A. Hebard, J. Fisher and J. Weaver for providing experimental results prior to publications. Discussions with Q. Si are acknowledged. This work is supported by The University Research Council of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Hebard *et al.*, Nature **350**, 600(1991).
- [2] For review see Accounts of Chemical Research **25** (March 1992) and J. Phys. Chem. Solids **53** (November 1992).
- [3] D. W. Murphy *et al.*, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **53**, 1321 (1992). M. Rosseinsky *et al.*, Nature **356**, 416 (1992). T. Yildirim *et al.*, Nature **360**, 568 (1992). R.M. Fleming *et al.*, Nature **352**, 701 (1991). Q. Zhu *et al.*, Science **254**, 545 (1991). P. W. Stephen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 453 (1992).
- [4] J. H. Weaver, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **53**, 1433 (1992). D. Poirier *et al.*, preprint.
- [5] S. Saito and A. Oshiyama, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2637 (1991). M. Menon and K.R. Subbaswamy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3487 (1991). O. Gunnarsson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 3002 (1991). S.C. Erwin and W.E. Pickett, Science **254**, 842 (1992). S. Sathpathy *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 1773 (1992).
- [6] Q. Zhu *et al.*, preprint. F. Stepniak *et al.*, preprint.
- [7] R. Lof *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3924 (1992). C. Gu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 6348 (1992).
- [8] V.P. Antropov *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 13647 (1992). M.P. Pederson and A.A. Quong, Phys. Rev. B **46**, 13584 (1992).
- [9] For recent reviews on the Hubbard model see *The Hubbard Model – Recent Results*, edited by M. Rasetti, World Scientific (Singapore) 1991.
- [10] M. P. Gelfand and J. P. Lu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1050 (1992); Phys. Rev. B **46**, 4367 (1992); preprint.
- [11] P. W. Stephens *et al.*, Nature **351**, 632 (1991). J.P. Lu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1551 (1992). W. I. F. David *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **18**, 219 (1992).

- [12] Notice that in the Hartree mean field approximation it is straightforward to show that the expectation of Hubbard U term is $x\frac{2N-1}{4N}U$ per particle, while the average kinetic energy is $\epsilon(x) = \frac{x-2N}{4N}W$ for a flat band with the band width W . Thus, the energy gain with respect to the disordered insulating state is $\Delta E = \frac{x-2N}{4N}(W - U)$. Thus $U_c = W$ independent of N and x .
- [13] W. Brinkman and T. Rice, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 4302 (1970).
- [14] M. Gutzwiller, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **137**, A1726 (1965).
- [15] J. P. Lu, to be published.
- [16] R. Tycko *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1912 (1992); W.H. Wong *et al.*, Europhys. Lett. **18**, 79 (1992). K. Holczer and R. L. Whetten, preprint. Y. Iwasa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2284 (1992).

FIGURES

FIG. 1. Phase diagrams for Mott-Hubbard metal-insulator transitions in N -fold degenerate Hubbard models. Shown are results for $N = 2, 3, 4, 5$. For $U > U_c(N, x)$ the system is a Mott-Hubbard insulator. Note that only the points, corresponding to integer (x) number of electrons per site, are meaningful.